

***REMARKS***

In the October 27, 2009 Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-10 stand rejected in view of prior art, and claim 10 was objected to because the claim identifier was inappropriate. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the October 27, 2009 Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8-10 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-5 and 7-10 are pending, with claims 1 and 8-10 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

***Claim Objection***

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 10 was objected to because the claim identified was inappropriate. More specifically, the identifier was (New), which was supposed to be (Currently Amended). In the instant amendment, Applicant has labeled claim 10 as (Currently Amended).

Applicant believes that claim 10 is now correct. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In items 1-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 10-211359 (Matsuzaki) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-0006909 (Mirasaki et al.). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8-10 as mentioned above.

More specifically, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that a running commentary returning function is for returning from the phrase of the second phrase group performing on the second running commentary function to the phrase of an interruption point

in the first phrase group interrupted on the process of the running commentary interrupting function when the specific events have occurred, and that the play-by-play or commentary is performed with the phrase of the first phrase group on the basis of running commentary terminology which is included in the phrase of the interruption point in the first phrase group interrupted by the running commentary interrupting function, when the process of the running commentary returning function has been executed. The above mentioned amendments are supported by the original disclosure. For example, paragraphs [0075] and [0078] of the specification disclose with regards to the point of interruption; therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter has been introduced.

Matsuzaki was cited in the Office Action to reject claim 1 by showing a terminology storing function, a first running commentary function, a running commentary interrupting function, a second running commentary function, a running commentary returning function, and a running commentary continuing function. Mirasaki was cited in the Office Action to reject claim 1 by showing choosing various words from various databases randomly to suit the comment of the game play, and showing that database switching interval or the commentary interrupts when commentary shifts from one database to another database based on the condition of the game.

Applicant respectfully asserts that U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-0006909 (Mirasaki et al.) is a U.S. counterpart application of Matsuzaki. Thus, the rejections made in the Office Action are fundamentally same as or similar to ones in the previous Office Action.

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Matsuzaki, Mirasaki et al., nor a combination thereof does not make the claimed invention obvious. As Applicant has amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the arrangement where the running commentary returning function is for returning from the phrase of the second phrase group

performing on the second running commentary function to the phrase of the **interruption point**. Considering Figures 5 and 6 of Matsuzaki, Applicant believes that Matsuzaki is **silent** in interrupting a comment, performing another comment, and returning to an interruption point of the previous comment. The Office Action states that the running commentary retuning function of the claimed invention is disclosed in paragraph [0064] of Matsuzaki, but Applicant believes that such part is **not** related to returning to the interruption point. Namely, claimed invention intends to return to the same point of time of a commentary after interruption for a different commentary. Applicant respectfully asserts that the above mentioned arrangements are **not** disclosed or suggested by Matsuzaki, Mirasaki et al. or any other prior art of record.

As claims 8-10 similarly recite, especially with regards to returning to the interruption point, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8-10 are allowable for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2-5 and 7 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, claims 2-5 and 7 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

\* \* \*

Appl. No. 10/595,162  
Amendment dated January 25, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2009

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-5 and 7-10 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Akiyoshi Onda /  
Akiyoshi Onda  
Reg. No. 63,773

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: January 25, 2010

S:\01-JAN10-AO\KC-US030568 Amendment.doc